### AT: Protectionism Turn

#### No risk of labor backlash – they like the plan

Kay 3, PhD candidate at UC Berkeley [Tamara, “Even Labor Unions Can Benefit From Free Trade,” 12-23-03, http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/even-labor-unions-can-gain-free-trade, CMR]

While NAFTA did not generate relationships among all North American unions, its effects on many unions were profound. Even the AFL-CIO - dubbed the AFL-CIA by progressive Mexican unionists during the Cold War - began to work with independent Mexican unions when its Mexican counterpart, the Congress of Mexican Workers, refused to oppose NAFTA. As one AFL-CIO official explained, "De facto in this process, solidarity links have been built and strengthened. And there's no question that due to this struggle over NAFTA, we have more working relations with the Mexican labor movement and with the Canadians with regard to Mexico than ever before." NAFTA also marked a turning point for how many US unions dealt with the issue of foreign workers and job flight. While NAFTA's introduction led a bevy of anti-free trade pundits to suggest that foreign workers were "stealing" American jobs, the AFL-CIO and leaders of most US unions did not join the melee. Matt Witt, Teamsters Communications Director during the fight against NAFTA offered one explanation: "The increased communication and contact with union activists from Mexico meant that whatever instinct people might have had to go in that direction ran up against the real coalition work people were doing based on the traditional union principle that you either raise and maintain standards together or you face a race to the bottom." Canadian labor leaders also actively eschewed racialized and divisive rhetoric during the free trade debates. In a 1990 letter to Shirley Carr, then President of the Canadian Labour Congress, Robert White (President of the Canadian Auto Workers, who later succeeded Carr at the CLC) wrote to suggest how the CLC should publicly frame issues related to the free trade agreement: "We have to not just avoid, but counter any racist tendencies. The enemy is not Mexican workers. It is corporations trying to escape obligations, and governments trying to guarantee these corporations "favourable" environment by attacking trade union, human and political rights." The emergence of trinational relationships in North America suggests that global governance institutions such as NAFTA can stimulate labor transnationalism by providing new political arenas and venues to advance labor interests. The implication is not that labor activists should embrace neoliberal free trade agreements. Indeed, NAFTA had significant negative effects on workers. Rather, activists should remain pro-actively engaged in the process of shaping and strengthening those agreements to ensure that they provide more political opportunities and democratic institutions, not fewer. Other scholars have shown that few social movements are as well-positioned to serve as ballast against the vagaries of an ever-expanding global economy as a transnational labor movement, with its established membership, political clout, and financial resources. If labor unions refuse to engage global governance institutions such as the NAALC, the FTAA, and the WTO, their ability not only to protect workers' rights, but also to serve as a mechanism to build labor transnationalism, will be compromised.

#### Labor has no clout – low membership, unpopularity, and recession

Suroweicki ‘11, [James, “State of the Unions,” 1-17-11, http://www.newyorker.com/talk/financial/2011/01/17/110117ta\_talk\_surowiecki, accessed 1-25-11]

Still, the advantages that union workers enjoy when it comes to pay and benefits are nothing new, while the resentment about these things is. There are a couple of reasons for this. In the past, a sizable percentage of American workers belonged to unions, or had family members who did. Then, too, even people who didn’t belong to unions often reaped some benefit from them, because of what economists call the “threat effect”: in heavily unionized industries, non-union employers had to pay their workers better in order to fend off unionization. Finally, benefits that union members won for themselves—like the eight-hour day, or weekends off—often ended up percolating down to other workers. These days, none of those things are true. Organized labor has been on the wane for decades, to the point where just seven per cent of private-sector workers belong to a union. The benefits that union members still get—like defined-contribution pensions or Cadillac health plans—are out of reach of most workers. And the disappearance of unions from the private sector has radically diminished the threat effect, meaning that unions don’t raise the wages of non-union workers. The result is that it’s easier to dismiss unions as just another interest group, enjoying perks that most workers cannot get. Even though unions remain the loudest political voice for workers’ interests, resentment has replaced solidarity, which helps explain why the bailout of General Motors was almost as unpopular as the bailouts of Wall Street banks. And, at a time when labor is already struggling to organize new workers, this is grim news. In a landmark 1984 study, the economists Richard Freeman and James Medoff showed that there was a strong connection between the public image of unions and how workers voted in union elections: the less popular unions were generally, the harder it was for them to organize. Labor, in other words, may be caught in a vicious cycle, becoming progressively less influential and more unpopular. The Great Depression invigorated the modern American labor movement. The Great Recession has crippled it.

#### Obama won’t bash NAFTA

Shear 9 Michael D, Feb 20, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/02/19/AR2009021902925.html>, CMR

**The president's message served as a reminder** of last year's private assessment by Canadian officials **that then-candidate Obama's frequent criticism of NAFTA was nothing more than campaign speeches aimed at chasing support among Rust Belt union workers.** "Much of the **rhetoric** that may be perceived to be protectionist is **more reflective of political maneuvering than policy,"** the Canadians concluded in a memo after meeting with Austan Goolsbee, a senior campaign aide and now a member of Obama's Council of Economic Advisers. ad\_icon

### AT: Politics – Link Turn

#### Existing border security plans will doom compromise – only the plan rebuilds support to break gridlock

Litan 13 (Robert E, “An Innovative Third Way to Break Immigration Gridlock”, March 20, http://go.bloomberg.com/bgov-briefs/2013/03/20/an-innovative-third-way-to-break-immigration-gridlock/ , CMR)

Securing the southern border stands as one of the biggest obstacles to immigration overhaul. Most Republicans, before they endorse a substantive legislative solution, want an impenetrable border to stanch the flow of undocumented workers into the U.S. Most Democrats want to move forward without waiting for the border to be completely sealed.¶ A recent Bloomberg Government analysis authored by Matthew Hummer may offer an innovative third way to break the gridlock.¶ So far both sides agree on two central elements of any bill: citizenship, or at least green cards, for 11 million illegal immigrants; and additional work visas for highly skilled immigrants, many of them educated at American universities. But until the government can demonstrate effective control over the Mexican border, this surprising bipartisan consensus may be for naught.¶ Hummer’s research points to a clever compromise that would defuse this controversy by taking account of several fundamental forces driving illegal immigration and Washington’s newfound budget austerity.¶ The solution: Spend several billion dollars now to improve border infrastructure and to help boost U.S.-Mexico trade. A modest amount spent to encourage exports would create more jobs in Mexico, decreasing emigration, and prove more cost-effective than spending tens of billions of dollars to gain control of remote border areas.¶ This conclusion follows from three propositions. First, economic factors are potentially more important than heightened border control efforts in limiting illegal immigration. BGOV research shows a tight correlation between apprehensions of illegal immigrants at the southern border and the ratio of gross domestic product growth rates in the U.S. and Mexico. When that ratio increased during the 1980s, border apprehensions rose to 1.7 million in 1986 from 760,000 in 1980. Conversely, when the GDP ratio falls, as it did during most of the post-1986 period, apprehensions decline.¶ The trend has become even more pronounced since 2006, when the Mexican economy outperformed the U.S. economy in all but one year. That led to a precipitous decline in apprehensions to fewer than 400,000 in 2012 from more than 1 million in 2006.¶ Second, border security is expensive. The Customs and Border Protection Agency spent about $11.6 billion on border enforcement in fiscal year 2012, increasing more than 30 percent from the average annual amount spent during President George W. Bush’s second term. Better border control driven by more security spending won’t necessarily reduce apprehensions to less than 400,000 a year. BGOV estimates that it might cost $28 billion a year to completely seal the border by 2019.¶ In this age of budget austerity, it’s inconceivable that another $16 billion a year could be found to completely insulate the border.¶ Third, more trade between the two countries would prove a cost-effective way to bring down an already reduced level of illegal immigration. BGOV research shows another important correlation: more Mexican exports means more stable employment for young Mexican males, who most often cross the border illegally to search for work in the U.S.¶ This finding suggests that if more money is spent at the border, it’s better to improve and expand checkpoints, which would reduce delays in moving imported and exported goods, than to build and monitor a longer fence. More exports of goods to the U.S. from Mexico would expand the current $500 billion bilateral trade relationship and provide more jobs for Mexican workers at home.¶ Congress can literally bridge the divides on an issue that begs for compromise by understanding the forces driving illegal immigration from Mexico and focusing on spending border security money in the most cost-effective manner.

#### Plan builds bipartisanship necessary for CIR

Pastor 13 – prof of IR @ American University

Robert A, “Robert A. Pastor: It's time for biometric ID cards”, <http://www.commercialappeal.com/news/2013/feb/03/robert-a-pastor-on-voter-fraud-and-illegal-high/>, CMR

A comprehensive immigration solution should not only include legalization and a workplace ID card, but also a North American investment fund to narrow the income gap between Mexico and the United States. The fund would connect North America with better transportation and infrastructure, promoting growth in Mexico that would reduce the incentive for people to migrate. As our second-largest market, Mexico's growth is also good for us.¶ A biometric card has a permanent and unique means of identifying each person and thus cannot be hacked or forged. More and more countries use it. In the U.S., the FDA uses it to combat fraud in the food stamp program; and Disney World takes biometric information from guests' fingerprints to ensure a multiday ticket is used by the same person. Some fear a national ID could be used improperly, but arbitrary abuse is far more likely if there are multiple, flawed IDs rather than a single, secure one.¶ It would not be easy or cheap, but Mexico did it, and the U.S. can too. To assuage concerns, the president and Congress could set up a group to propose ways to ensure privacy, prevent identify theft and address any other concerns. Acting on these two issues in this way could not only prove bipartisanship is possible, it could solve two vexing issues.

### Energy Adv – AT: Oil Dependence K Heg

#### Oil dependence causes enemy leverage over foreign policy- destroys leadership

Parthemore and Nagl 10

[Christine Parthemore is a fellow at the Center for New American Security \*\*Dr. John Nagl is President of the Center for New American Security [<http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS_Fueling%20the%20Future%20Force_NaglParthemore.pdf>, “Fueling the Future Force Preparing the Department of Defense for a Post-Petroleum Era” September 2010]

The growing world demand for **petroleum presents major geostrategic risks**. **High prices and rising demand are a boon to** major suppliers and reserve holders such as **Iran and Venezuela, which are unfriendly to the United States**. It also affects the international behavior of rising powers such as **China**, which **is on a quest to secure access to natural resources** that is in turn expanding its influence **around the globe**. In Mexico, one of the top suppliers of petroleum to the United States, pipelines serve as an increasingly attractive target for dangerous cartels to fund activities that could undermine the Mexican government, destabilize the region and decrease U.S. homeland security.4 **American foreign policy** itself **has been colored by its** growing **petroleum demands** since the 1970s oil crises and subsequent declaration of the Carter doctrine, which stipulated that the United States would consider threats to the Persian Gulf region threats to its “vital interests” due to the strategic importance of its petroleum reserves.5 **Dependence** on petroleum for 94 percent of transportation fuel **is** also **a** dangerous **strategic risk** for the United States **given** **the** leverage oil can provide **to supplier countries**. Many European allies have experienced such leverage in action with Russia periodically threatening to reduce or cut off natural gas exports to countries highly reliant on their supplies (and in some cases carrying through with these threats). Similarly, national oil companies and **OPEC** **can choose to** increase or **decrease their production** rates to drive changes in the market. **The more the United States reduces its dependence** on petroleum, **the better it can** hedge against petroleum suppliers exerting political leverage over U.S. interests, including **in times of crisis**. At the operational level, heavy reliance on liquid fuels also constitutes a force protection challenge for DOD. Fuel supply convoys have been vulnerable to attack in both Iraq and Afghanistan, where the services have struggled to adapt to the challenges of terrorism, insurgency and violent extremism. In addition to minimizing these risks in the current wars, DOD must also conceptualize and plan for what the future will likely hold for America’s security. The Navy’s battle against pirates off the coast of the Horn of Africa foreshadows the littoral and unconventional challenges that await the United States in the coming decades, as populations continue to migrate toward the world’s coastal area. These types of **problems** often manifest **at** major shipping chokepoints (including petroleum transit chokepoints), and addressing them **will include distinctive fueling requirements**. The Air Force, likewise, confronts dramatic changes in manned and unmanned flight, in addition to the proliferation of space technologies, all of which could dramatically alter fuel needs. In another example, one recently published AirSea battle concept focused on **China** notes that the type of **conflict** it outlines could **require** hardening fueling infrastructure, improving aerial refueling, “**stockpiling petrol, oil, and lubricants**” and potentially “running undersea fuel pipelines between Guam, Tinian and Saipan.”6 As the character of warfare changes, **DOD will have to continue to consider the** attraction of fuel supply lines to opponents.